



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,665	09/30/2003	Philippe Diehl	003921.00139	2038
22907	7590	02/19/2009		
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			EXAMINER	
			CHRISS, ANDREW W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
02/19/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,665	Applicant(s) DIEHL ET AL.
	Examiner Andrew Chriss	Art Unit 2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,9-14,20-24 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,9-14,20-24 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 3, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment, filed December 3, 2008, has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1, 9, 20, and 24 are amended, Claim 28 is new, Claims 5-8, 15-19, and 25-27 are canceled, and Claims 1-4, 9-14, 20-24, and 28 are currently pending.
3. In light of Applicant's amendment to Claims 1, 9, 20, and 24, rejection of Claims 1-4, 9-14, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. **Claims 21, 24, and 28 rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with

Art Unit: 2419

which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claim limitation “second signal inclusion schedule” is not enabled. Applicant’s specification discloses multiple messaging schedules (paragraph 0061), but these messaging schedules are not signal inclusion schedules, as claimed. Applicant’s specification further discloses a message formation and send block having a signal inclusion schedule (paragraph 31) and a message receive and disassembly block having a signal inclusion schedule (paragraph 34). Therefore, Applicant’s specification does not provide sufficient direction to one skilled in the art to make and use the invention, wherein the emulation integrated circuit comprises a second signal inclusion schedule.

6. **Claim 28** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant’s specification, as originally filed, does not disclose a first and second signal inclusion schedule being different from one another. Therefore, the claim limitation “wherein the first signal inclusion schedule and the second signal inclusion schedule are different signal inclusion schedules” constitutes new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. **Claims 1-3, 9-13, and 20-24** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reblewski et al (United States Patent 6,265,894), hereinafter Reblewski, in view of Kappler et al (United States Patent 6,064,677), hereinafter Kappler, and Lin (United States Patent Application Publication US 2003/0144828 A1).

Regarding Claims 1 and 9, Reblewski teaches a reconfigurable integrated circuit for use in an emulation system (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 2). However, Reblewski does not teach a storage unit comprising a signal inclusion schedule or circuitry operative to generate and transmit a message. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a calendar queue mechanism for scheduling transport of units or cells, specifically high frequency/high priority flows and low frequency/low priority flows (column 12, line 65 – column 13, line 10). Further, Kappler teaches a set of transmit lists 65, connected to calendar queue 63 (Figure 3), which generate and transmit the messages released by the calendar queue (column 11, lines 25-30). As mentioned above, the calendar queue specifies the frequency of the signals to include. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-

multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms. However, the aforementioned references do not disclose selecting a plurality of signals from at least one pin. In the same field of endeavor, Lin discloses a reconfigurable logic circuit (paragraph 0688) wherein a scheduler accesses registers at input and output pins to control inter-chip signal movement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the scheduler disclosed in Lin with the reconfigurable integrated disclosed in Reblewski, as modified above, in order to avoid hold time violations in look-up table delay in FPGA chips.

Regarding Claims 2 and 10, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach signals determined to be more critical transmitted more frequently. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler further teaches flows having different frequencies are prioritized so that the data transport units of the higher frequency flows are given transmit priority over any data transport units of lower frequency flows with which they happen to collide (column 12, lines 30-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 3 and 12, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach generating and transmitting a message in a plurality of clock cycles of an operating clock independent of an emulation clock. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler further teaches that the calendar queue 63 implements a stalled virtual clock so that cells that are scheduled for transmission are leased for transmission

only when system “real time” has reached their respective scheduled transmission times (column 11, lines 21-25). Therefore, messages are generated in a plurality of clock cycles of an operating clock independent of the predetermined rate of the overall system clock (column 8, lines 53-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 11, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claim 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach the message comprising state values. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches that each outbound message contain VP and VC identifiers (Figure 2), equivalent to Applicant’s disclosed state value (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 13, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claim 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach extracting a parity value from a message. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches reading a CRC (parity) value from an inbound cell (Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data

transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 20, Reblewski teaches an integrated circuit for use in an emulation system, as described with regards to Claims 1 and 9. Reblewski further teaches multiple reconfigurable logic resources (Figure 2), output pins 113, and a partial scan register that receives a plurality of output signals from logic elements (column lines 6-15), equivalent to Applicant's claimed message formation and send block. However, Reblewski does not teach a signal inclusion schedule. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a signal inclusion schedule, as discussed with regards to Claims 1 and 9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms. However, the aforementioned references do not disclose selecting at least one of the multiple output signals when the message is generated. In the same field of endeavor, Lin discloses a reconfigurable logic circuit (paragraph 0688) wherein a scheduler accesses registers at input and output pins to control inter-chip signal movement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the scheduler disclosed in Lin with the reconfigurable integrated disclosed in Reblewski, as modified above, in order to avoid hold time violations in look-up table delay in FPGA chips.

Regarding Claim 21, Reblewski teaches an input pin 113. Reblewski further teaches a logic element that receives multiple inputs and outputs a single signal (truth table 202).

However, Reblewski does not teach the claimed message receive and disassembly block nor the signal inclusion schedule. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a switching fabric that decomposes cells into four bit wide “nibbles” for arbitration and routing (column 10, lines 7-13), equivalent to Applicant’s claimed message received and disassembly block. Kappler further teaches a signal inclusion schedule, as discussed with regards to Claims 1 and 9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 22, Reblewski teaches a plurality of output pins 113. Further, Reblewski teaches an array of reconfigurable integrated circuits in Figure 10, thereby teaching multiple partial scan registers.

Regarding Claim 23, Reblewski teaches an array of reconfigurable integrated circuits in Figure 10, thereby teaching a plurality of reconfigurable logic resources in communication with the message formation and send block.

Regarding Claim 24, Reblewski teaches an integrated circuit for use in an emulation system, as described with regards to Claims 1, 9, and 20. Reblewski further teaches multiple reconfigurable logic resources (Figure 2) and input pins 113. However, Reblewski does not teach the claimed message receive and disassembly block nor the signal inclusion schedule. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a switching fabric that decomposes cells into four bit wide “nibbles” for arbitration and routing (column 10, lines 7-13), equivalent to Applicant’s claimed message received and disassembly block. Kappler further teaches a signal inclusion

schedule, as discussed with regards to Claims 1 and 9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms. However, the aforementioned references do not disclose selecting a plurality of signals from at least one pin. In the same field of endeavor, Lin discloses a reconfigurable logic circuit (paragraph 0688) wherein a scheduler accesses registers at input and output pins to control inter-chip signal movement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the scheduler disclosed in Lin with the reconfigurable integrated disclosed in Reblewski, as modified above, in order to avoid hold time violations in look-up table delay in FPGA chips.

10. **Claims 4 and 14** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reblewski in view of Kappler and Lin as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Sindhushayana et al (United States Patent Application Publication US 2003/0053435 A1), hereinafter Sindhushayana. Reblewski, Kappler, and Lin teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 13, as discussed above. However, the references do not teach a parity bit generator. In the same field of endeavor, Sindhushayana teaches a channel interleaver that permutes systematic bits with parity bits, thus generating a parity value and transmitting a message containing a parity value. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the parity value generator taught in Sindhushayana with the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski, as modified above, in order to employ an error correction system that overcomes the impact of interference in a wireless system.

Art Unit: 2419

11. **Claim 28** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reblewski in view of Kappler and Lin as applied to Claim 24 above, and further in view of Parruck et al (United States Patent 6,198,723), hereinafter Parruck. The combination of Reblewski, Kappler, and Lin discloses all of the limitations of Claim 24, as described above. However, the aforementioned references do not disclose different signal inclusion schedules. In the same field of endeavor, Parruck discloses a traffic shaping device using multiple round robin schedulers (Figure 4, 212; column 7, lines 61-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the multiple schedulers disclosed in Parruck with the reconfigurable IC disclosed in Reblewski, as modified above, in order to shape output traffic and meet quality of service criteria.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to rejection of Claims 1-4, 9-14, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Chriss whose telephone number is (571)272-1774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2419

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Chriss
Examiner
Art Unit 2419
2/10/2009

/A. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Hassan Kizou/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419